



CONGRESSMAN CURT WELDON

7th District Pennsylvania



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

February 16, 2000

CONTACT: Maureen Cragin

Ryan Vaart

(202) 225-2539

**STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CURT WELDON
CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
HEARING ON THE MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS**

N
E
W
S

R
E
L
E
A
S
E

This morning, the Military Research and Development Subcommittee and the Procurement Subcommittee meet jointly in open session to receive testimony on the ballistic missile defense programs of the Department of Defense. I want to welcome my colleague and good friend Duncan Hunter, the chairman of the Procurement Subcommittee, as well as our good friends from the other side of the aisle Owen Pickett, the ranking member of the R&D subcommittee and Norm Sisisky, the ranking member of the Procurement subcommittee.

We also welcome today's witness, Lt. General Ronald T. Kadish, U.S. Air Force, Director of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization. General, this is your first appearance before our committee, and I'm looking forward to your testimony. Thank you for being with us today.

We are going to explore here today the full range of BMD issues, and much of what we'll hear today will be very positive. I want to stress three points.

First, we've long since past the threat threshold. We've known for a long time that North Korea is developing theater and long-range ballistic missiles. We've known for a couple of years that Iran has been developing missiles capable of threatening U.S. forces and allies in the Middle East. Iraq and other Middle Eastern nations are developing missile arsenals as well. Our own Department of Defense says the same thing: the threat threshold has been crossed. Secretary Cohen believes that Iran will have a missile capable of threatening all of NATO within 5 to 10 years. His conclusion: we need to deploy TMD systems and a limited NMD system.

Second: now, after a long period of frustration and delay, we've had string of great successes in the development of BMD systems. The THAAD program conducted two successful hit-to-kill intercept tests. PAC-3 now has three consecutive hits and, in the most recent intercept test just a couple of weeks ago, demonstrated its remote launch capability that will expand the footprint it can defend.

The NMD system also conducted a successful intercept test October, and last month conducted a test that demonstrated successfully the integration of virtually the entire NMD system. While we can't minimize the fact that the January test missed the target, I want to stress my view that this test was more challenging and, in many ways, more successful than the earlier one, and it demonstrated substantial
(MORE)

technical progress in the NMD program. I am also encouraged that the problem uncovered in the January test is apparently a minor one, not a fundamental problem of science or engineering.

By my simple arithmetic, that's six out of the last seven, and one near miss. That's either six "accidental" successes, as the critics keep suggesting, or conclusive evidence that hit-to-kill technology can and will work.

And third, I believe we have to move ahead as rapidly and efficiently as we can with these systems. I am concerned that, while the BMDO budget request is better than this Administration has ever managed in the past, that key programs are restrained by lack of funding. Lt. Gen. Kadish, I would appreciate hearing your views on that and whether you believe any of your programs could move forward more rapidly, without increasing risk, if more funding were available. I am especially concerned that BMDO's technology funding has been reduced \$100 million from last year's level and I understand that your entire innovative S&T budget is just \$7 million. This level of technology funding, I believe, is clearly inadequate to meet future BMD requirements.

###